



I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

On March 19, 2003 -

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREY, LLP

By: Stephanie J. Whitehurst

Attorney Docket No.: 20695C-001900US
Client Ref. No.: V-261.00

RECEIVED

MAR 28 2003

TECH CENTER 1600/2300

#6
Election
4/9/03

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Meyer

Application No.: 10/006,882

Filed: December 10, 2001

For: METHOD OF LARGE SCALE
PRODUCTION OF HEPATITIS A
VIRUS

Examiner: Stacy S. Brown

Art Unit: 1648

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed February 19, 2003, Applicants elect with traverse to prosecute the claims of Group I directed to a method for continuous production of hepatitis A virus and a cell culture. In particular, Applicants respectfully request that Groups I and II be examined together.

The Examiner has placed Groups I and II in the same subclass. Thus, the restriction between these groups is improper. The MPEP states that where claims can be examined together without undue burden, the Examiner must examine the claims on the merits even though they are directed to independent and distinct inventions. *See*, MPEP § 803. In establishing that an "undue burden" would exist for co-examination of claims, the Examiner must show that examination of the claims would involve substantially different prior art searches, making the co-examination burdensome. In order to show

RECEIVED

MAR 28 2003

PATENT

Meyer
Application No.: 10/006,882
Page 2

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

undue burden resulting from searching difficulties, the Examiner must show that the restricted groups have separate classification, acquired a separate status in the art, or that searching would require different fields of search. According to the MPEP, where the classification is the same and the field of search is the same and there is no clear indication of separate future classification and field of search, no reasons exist for dividing among related inventions. *See*, MPEP § 808.02 (C).


Applicants respectfully submit that the inventions can readily be searched together without an undue burden, particularly since both groups are drawn to methods of producing hepatitis A virus particles. In the Office Action, the Examiner provides no rationale for separating the claims of Group I from those of Group II. In the absence of a showing as to why examination of the two groups meets the criteria set for the above, the restriction is improper and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin Bastian
Reg. No. 34,774

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, 8th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
KLB:ERS
SF 1442438 v1

